



## II. Discussion

Neither motion was filed in conformity with this Court's Local Civil Rules. Each motion omitted the certification regarding attempts to confer with opposing counsel required by Local Civil Rule 7.1(b). Likewise, the motions were not supported by briefs, which are to be filed contemporaneously with most motions pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7.1(c).

More substantively, the relief sought by the motions is not clear. Plaintiff's Motion to Take Judicial Notice consists of several pages of citations and generalized statements quoting from portions of the North Carolina Constitution and other sources. Plaintiff's Motion to Moot Point Inadvertent Mistake and Amend Complaint, which mentions an "insufficient claim number", is similarly unclear. Thus, even giving appropriate latitude to the motions due to the fact that Plaintiff has elected to proceed *pro se*, both motions violate the requirement of Local Civil Rule 7.1(a) that "unless made during a hearing or trial, all motions . . . must state with particularity the grounds for the motion and the relief or order sought."

## III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion to Take Judicial Notice (Doc. 11) and Motion to Moot Point Inadvertent Mistake and Amend Complaint (Doc. 12) are hereby **DENIED.**

Signed: November 19, 2018



W. Carleton Metcalf  
United States Magistrate Judge

